

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION TWENTY-ONE

CASE NO. 21-RC-178527

BUENA PARK HONDA,

Employer,

and

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MACHINISTS AND AEROSPACE
WORKERS, LODGE NO. 1484,

Petitioner.

**BUENA PARK HONDA'S REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF THE REGIONAL
DIRECTOR'S DECISION AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION
CASE NO. 21-RC-178527**

Prepared by:

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH,
SMOAK AND STEWART, P.C.

Daniel A. Adlong

Counsel for Buena Park Honda

Park Tower, 695 Town Center Drive, Suite 1500
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
(714) 800-7900
(714) 754-1298 (fax)

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND AND BASIS FOR REVIEW	1
III. ISSUES	2
A. Whether the Regional Director, who did not even analyze the dual-function issue, correctly excluded lube technicians from the unit where the Regional Director made all the factual findings necessary to indicate they qualify as dual-function employees under Board precedent.	2
B. Whether the unit directed by the Regional Director is an inappropriate fractured unit composed of employees who do not share a legally sufficient community of interest apart from other Buena Park Service Drive employees.	3
C. Whether the Regional Director made clear errors on substantial factual issues that prejudice the Petitioner.	3
1. Whether the Regional Director correctly excluded six lube technicians from the unit when the Regional Director admitted they have legally sufficient community of interest with, interact with, and are functionally integrated with the work of the other service technicians that form the directed unit.	3
D. Whether the Regional Director ignored long-standing precedent which establishes that the service technicians and lube technicians are traditionally included in the same craft unit.	3
IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS	3
A. General Background	3
1. Managerial and supervisory structure	3
2. The service drive	3
3. Workflow within the service drive	4
4. Specific job duties of service drive employees	5
a. Service advisor	5
b. Service technicians	6
c. Lube technicians	8
d. Counterpersons	8
e. Porter	8

f. Parts driver	9
g. Shuttle driver.....	9
h. Shipping & receiving	9
5. Pay, policies, training, and supervision	9
a. Hiring/Orientation.....	9
b. Policies.....	10
c. Benefits and employee pay	10
d. Supervision	10
e. Breakrooms and restrooms	10
V. ARGUMENT.....	11
A. Any Unit that Includes Service Technicians Must Also Include Lube Technicians Since They Qualify as Dual-Function Employees.....	11
B. An Appropriate Unit Must Include the Lube Technicians Otherwise the Region Will Create an Inappropriate Sub-Unit of “Technicians”	14
1. The law regarding appropriate units	14
2. The law regarding “readily identifiable and “fractured” units.....	15
3. The directed unit of technicians creates a fractured unit	16
4. The proper unit should include at least one of the following units.....	19
a. The highly-integrated nature of the service drive necessitates the inclusion of all the requested employees.....	19
b. The proper unit should include lube technicians, service advisors, counterpersons, and shipping & receiving.....	21
c. The proper unit should include lube technicians, counterpersons, and shipping & receiving.....	21
d. The proper unit should include lube technicians and service advisors.....	22
e. The highly-integrated nature of the service drive demonstrates that at least lube technicians and service technicians must be included in the same unit.....	22

i.	Applicable Board Law Including <i>Specialty Healthcare</i> Instructs That The Appropriate Unit, At A Minimum, Includes Lube Technicians and Service Technicians	22
ii.	Service technicians and lube technicians have significant wage overlap	25
iii.	Other factors prove there is community-of-interest between service technicians and lube technicians	26
C.	The Regional Director Erred in Applying the Board’s Factors for Determining Craft Status.....	27
1.	Formal training or participation in apprenticeship program	27
2.	Substantial functional integration between the work of excluded and included employees	28
3.	Overlapping job duties	29
4.	Whether the employer assigns work according to need rather than based on craft or jurisdictional lines	29
5.	Common interests	29
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
NLRB Cases	
<i>Air Liquide America Corp.</i> , 324 NLRB 661 (1997)	13
<i>Avco Corp.</i> , 308 NLRB 1045 (1992)	13
<i>Berea Publ'g Co.</i> , 140 NLRB 516 (1963)	11
<i>The Boeing Company</i> , 337 NLRB 152 (2001)	15
<i>Brand Precision Services</i> , 313 NLRB 657 (1994)	15
<i>Bredero Shaw</i> , 345 NLRB 782 (2005)	12
<i>Burns & Roe Services Corp.</i> , 313 NLRB 1307 (1994)	27
<i>Colorado National Bank of Denver</i> , 204 NLRB 243 (1973)	15
<i>Country Ford Trucks, Inc.</i> , 330 NLRB 328 (1999)	25
<i>Desert Toyota</i> , 346 NLRB 132 (2005)	23
<i>Dodge City of Wauwatosa, Inc.</i> , 282 NLRB 459 (1986)	23, 24, 28
<i>Fletcher Jones Chevrolet</i> , 300 NLRB 875 (1990)	13, 24, 27
<i>Halsted Commc'n</i> , 347 NLRB 225 (2006)	11
<i>Hartzheim Dodge, Inc.</i> , 354 NLRB No. 22 (2009)	23

<i>Home Depot USA, Inc.,</i> 331 NLRB 1289 (2000)	14
<i>Jerry's Chevrolet, Cadillac,</i> 344 NLRB 689 (2005)	19, 22
<i>In re Medlar Elec., Inc.,</i> 337 NLRB 796 (2002)	12, 14
<i>Odwalla, Inc.,</i> 357 NLRB 1608 (2011)	16
<i>Overnite Transportation Co.,</i> 322 NLRB 723 (1996)	23, 24
<i>Oxford Chem., Inc.,</i> 286 NLRB 187 (1987)	11, 13
<i>Publix Super Markets, Inc.,</i> 343 NLRB No. 109 (2004)	20
<i>Seaboard Marine, Ltd.,</i> 327 NLRB 556 (1999)	15, 16
<i>Specialty Healthcare & Rehabilitation Center of Mobile,</i> 357 NLRB No. 83 (2011)	1, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22
<i>Re Stevens Creek Chrysler Jeep Dodge, Inc.,</i> 357 NLRB 633 (2011)	23
<i>Stevens Pontiac-GMC, Inc.,</i> 295 NLRB 599 (1989)	23
<i>TDK Ferrites Corp.,</i> 342 NLRB 1006 (2004)	15, 16
<i>Transerv Systems,</i> 311 NLRB 766 (1993)	15
<i>United Rentals,</i> 341 NLRB No. 72 (2004)	19
<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.,</i> 328 NLRB 904 (1999)	25

Federal Cases

Blue Man Vegas, LLC v. NLRB,
529 F.3d 417 (D.C. Cir. 2008).....15

Country Ford Trucks v. National Labor Relations Board,
229 F.3rd 1184 (D.C. Circuit (2000)).....25

Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.,
380 U.S. 438, 442 (1965).....15

NLRB v. Contemporary Cars, Inc.,
667 F.3d 1364 (11th Cir. 2012)23, 24, 25